

C. Todd Norris (State Bar No. 181337)
todd.norris@bullivant.com
BULLIVANT HOUSER BAILEY PC
601 California Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94108-2823
Phone: 415.352.2700
Fax: 415.352.2701

Mario Aieta (*pro hac vice*)
maieta@ssbb.com
SATTERLEE STEPHENS BURKE & BURKE LLP
230 Park Avenue, Suite 1130
New York, NY 10169
Phone: (212) 818-9200
Fax: (212) 818-9606

Attorneys for Nominal Counterclaim
Defendant
ISIS INNOVATION LIMITED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ARIA DIAGNOSTICS, INC.)	Case No. 3:11-cv-06391-SI
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
)	ISIS INNOVATION, LIMITED'S
SEQUENOM, INC.,)	ANSWER TO THE THIRD PARTY
Defendant/)	COMPLAINT OF SEQUENOM, INC.
Counterclaim-Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
)	
ARIA DIAGNOSTICS, INC.)	
Counterclaim-Defendant,)	
v.)	
)	
ISIS INNOVATION LIMITED,)	
Nominal Counterclaim-)	
Defendant,)	
)	

1 Nominal Counterclaim–Defendant Isis Innovation Limited (“Isis”), through its
2 undersigned counsel, hereby answers the Third Party Complaint of plaintiff Sequenom, Inc.
3 (Docket No. 33, denominated “Answer to Complaint with Jury Demand , Counterclaim With
4 Jury Demand Against Aria Diagnostics., Inc., Isis Innovation Limited by Sequenom, Inc.” and
5 hereinafter referred to as the “Counterclaim”), as follows:

- 6 1. Isis admits the allegations of paragraph 1 of the Counterclaim.
- 7 2. Isis is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
8 truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Counterclaim.
- 9 3. Isis admits the allegations of the first sentence of paragraph 4 of the
10 Counterclaim. Isis further admits that it has thus far not agreed to Sequenom’s request that Isis
11 join this lawsuit. The remaining allegations of paragraph 5 state legal conclusions that do not
12 require an answer.
- 13 4. The allegations of paragraph 5 of the Counterclaim state legal conclusions as to
14 which no answer is required.
- 15 5. Isis is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
16 truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraph 6 of the Counterclaim.
- 17 6. In response to the allegations of paragraph 7 of the Counterclaim, Isis admits
18 that this Court has personal jurisdiction over Isis because Isis hereby consents to the
19 jurisdiction of this Court for the purposes of adjudicating the claims and defenses that may be
20 properly asserted in this action by the parties to this action. Isis denies that it has purposely
21 availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities within this State and District.
- 22 7. The allegations of paragraph 8 of the Counterclaim state legal conclusions as to
23 which no answer is required.
- 24 8. Isis admits the allegations of paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Counterclaim.
- 25 9. Isis is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
26 truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraph 11 through 15 of the Counterclaim.

1 10. In response to paragraph 16 of the Counterclaim, Isis repeats and realleges the
2 foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

3 11. Isis is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
4 truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraph 17 through 19 of the Counterclaim.

5
6
7 Dated: April 9, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

SATTERLEE STEPHENS BURKE &
BURKE LLP

8
9
10 By: 

Mario Aieta
(*pro hac vice*)
maieta@ssbb.com
SATTERLEE STEPHENS BURKE
& BURKE LLP
230 Park Avenue, Suite 1130
New York, NY 10169
Phone: (212) 818-9200
Fax: (212) 818-9606

C. Todd Norris
(State Bar No. 181337)
todd.norris@bullivant.com
BULLIVANT HOUSER
BAILEY PC
601 California Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94108-2823
Phone: 415.352.2700
Fax: 415.352.2701

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Attorneys for Nominal
Counterclaim Defendant
23 ISIS INNOVATION LIMITED
24
25
26
27
28